

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending, with claim 1 being the sole independent claim. Claims 1-2 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, in view of the following amendments and remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,106,277 (“*Tuckey*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,121,021 (“*Ward*”). For the following reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejections are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “wherein the electric motor stator ring and an adjoining component of at least one of the motor casing and the magnet shells comprise a single-piece body formed entirely from a same material”. No new matter has been added. The combination of the cited art fails to teach or suggest this limitation.

The Examiner (at pg. 4 of the Office Action) has acknowledged that *Tuckey* fails to teach or suggest “a one-piece body comprising the stator ring (30) and a adjoining at least one motor casing or the magnet shells”, and cites *Ward* to provide “the final remaining element missing from that of the primary *Tuckey* reference”. Applicants, however, disagree that the combination of *Tuckey* and *Ward* achieves now amended independent claim 1.

The Examiner (at pg. 5 of the Office Action) asserts that:

The composite material is molded to the permanent magnet. It, accordingly, is another object of this invention to provide a method of manufacturing a frame and permanent magnet assembly where a composite material of the type described is molded to the permanent magnet.” (Column 1, lines 24-32).... [I]t can be seen that the stator ring and magnets are formed (i.e., molded) together as a single piece 14, and therefore meet the claimed limitation of a single-piece body”.

Applicants disagree that *Ward* provides “the final remaining element missing from that of the primary *Tuckey* reference”, i.e., “at least one of the motor casing and the magnet shells

comprise a single-piece body formed entirely from a same material,” as recited in now amended independent claim 1.

Ward relates to “a frame and permanent magnet assembly for a dynamoelectric machine where the frame carries a plurality of permanent magnets. The frame is formed of iron powder particles that are bound together by a thermoplastic material” (see Abstract). *Ward* (col. 1, lines 24-32) expressly explains that “[t]he composite magnetic frame material is comprised of iron powder particles having a particle size in a range of about 10 to 250 microns that are coated with a thin layer of thermoplastic material. The composite material is molded to the permanent magnet”. *Ward* thus teaches two different materials are molded to the permanent magnet, i.e., (i) iron particles and (ii) a thin layer of thermoplastic.

The Examiner has provided a detailed analysis of the *Ward* reference, and has clearly argued that the components of *Ward* are formed as a single piece but are manufactured entirely from different materials (see col. 1, line 24-32 of *Ward*). There is nothing in *Ward* with respect to a stator ring and an adjoining component of at least one of the motor casing and the magnet shells that form a one-piece body formed from the same materials. That is, the claimed invention replaces components that are formed from different materials with a component formed entirely from the same single piece of material. Moreover, the components of the claimed fuel feed unit that are formed into a single-piece body have different functions. That is, the claimed electric motor stator ring and an adjoining component of at least one of the motor casing and the magnet shells each have different functions. There is no teaching or suggestion in *Tuckey* or *Ward* of applicants’ claimed components which are arranged in a single-piece body that is made of the same material. Therefore, the combination of *Tuckey* and *Ward* fails to achieve now amended independent claim 1, because *Ward* fails to provide what *Tuckey* lacks.

In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over the combination of *Tuckey* and *Ward*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are therefore in order, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

In view of the patentability of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-7 are also patentable over the prior art for the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

Based on the foregoing remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By


Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: February 13, 2009